REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-21 in the application. In previous responses, the Applicant amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 15. In the present response, the Applicant has not amended, canceled, or added any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 7-9, 14-16, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 7-9, 14-16, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,215,784 to Petras, *et al.* (hereinafter "Petras"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees since the cited portions of Petras do not teach extracting a destination address for a subsequent telephone call from calling number identification signals received from a first telephone call over a circuit-switched telephone network from a first caller to a second caller and employing the destination address to automatically initiate the subsequent call to the destination address via a computer network as recited in independent Claims 1, 8, and 15.

The Examiner cites column 7, lines 16-40 and column 8, lines 31-41 to assert that Petras teaches extracting from calling number identification signals a destination address of a first caller for a subsequent telephone call from a second call to the first caller. (*See* Examiner's Action of July 22, 2008, pages 2-3.) The cited portions of Petras teach that on receipt of a call from a subscriber who wishes to speak in person with a sender of an electronic mail message received from the sender, a CTI server 40 extracts a telephone number of the subscriber and passes the telephone number in a message to warm-line server 38. The warm-line server 38 accepts the message and uses the

telephone number of the subscriber to locate the subscriber's service record. The telephone number identifies the subscriber 32 and the warm-line server 38 formulates a data message to an IP address of the subscriber's PC 36 and transmits a message that requests that information be retrieved from an open warm-line enabled application on the PC 36. The message is received by the warm-line function 60 on the subscriber's PC 36 which then retrieves information of the sender of the electronic mail message. The warm-line function 60 returns the retrieved information back to the warm-line server 38 which then obtains a telephone number associated with the electronic mail address. The CTI server then completes a call to the obtained telephone number and joins the subscriber with the telephone 58 of the sender of the electronic mail message.

Thus, the cited portions of Petras teach that a subscriber who wishes to speak in person with the sender of a received electronic mail message calls a CTI server which extracts a phone number associated with the electronic mail address of the sender and connects the subscriber with the sender of the electronic mail message. The cited portions of Petras do not teach: 1) extracting a destination address for a subsequent call over a computer network from calling number identification signals received; 2) extracting the destination address from a first telephone call over circuit-switched telephone network; and 3) employing the destination address of the first caller to automatically initiate a subsequent telephone call to the destination address via a computer network. On the contrary, the cited portions of Petras teach: 1) extracting a telephone number for a subsequent call from a warm-line application resident on a PC of the second caller; 2) extracting the destination address from an electronic mail address from an electronic mail message; and 3) employing the destination address of the first caller to automatically initiate a subsequent telephone call to the

destination address via a circuit-switched network.

For at least these reasons, the cited portions of Petras neither teach nor suggest extracting a destination address for a subsequent telephone call from calling number identification signals received from a first telephone call over a circuit-switched telephone network from a first caller to a second caller and employing the destination address to automatically initiate the subsequent call to the destination address via a computer network as recited in independent Claims 1, 8, and 15. As such, the cited portions of Petras do not anticipate independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102(e) rejection of Claims 1-2, 7-9, 14-16, and 21 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-21under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,760,324 to Scott, *et al.* (hereinafter "Scott") in view of Petras. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner recognizes that Scott does not explicitly disclose extracting from calling number identification signals a destination address of a first caller for a subsequent telephone call from a second caller to the first caller and cites Petras to cure this deficiency of Scott. (*See* Examiner's Action of July 22, 2008, page 6.) However, as established above, Petras does not teach extracting a destination address for a subsequent call over a computer network from calling number identification signals received. As such, Petras does not cure the deficiency of Scott noted by the Examiner. Therefore, the cited combination of cited portions of Scott and Petras does not provide a

prima facie case of obviousness for independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-21 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,110,395 to Blair (hereinafter "Blair"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner recognizes that Scott does not teach extracting a destination address for a subsequent telephone call and cites Fig. 2 and column 2, lines 42-60 of Blair to assert that Blair teaches extracting a destination address for a subsequent telephone call initiated over a computer network from a second caller to a first caller. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that "a call identifier will be sent along with the call signal" teaches extracting a destination address. (*See* Examiner's Action of July 22, 2008, pages 15-16.) However, the call identifier relied upon by the Examiner is not the claimed destination address since Blair teaches that both the origination phone 10 and destination phone 12 call a network service provider at step 26 of Fig. 2. Steps 28 and 30 of Fig. 2 of Blair teach that once the network service provider receives the calls from the origination phone 10 and destination phone 12, the network service provider allows for a data connection between the two phones. The use of a network service provider is required to enable the data connection unlike the invention as presently claimed where the destination address is extracted from the first telephone call and no service provider is needed.

Thus, the cited portions of Blair as applied by the Examiner do not cure the noted deficiencies of Scott. As such, the cited combination of Scott and Blair does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-21 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Comment on Cited References

The Applicants reserve further review of the references cited but not relied upon if relied upon in the future.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the Claims currently pending in this application are in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-21.

Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned agent of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

Steven J. Hanke
Registration No. 58,076

Dated: October 20, 2008

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800